

REMARKS

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11-16 and 21-27 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Cleve.

Independent claims 1 and 12 now recite “wherein the number of barcodes in the plurality of barcodes exceed the number of different types of tags attached to the plurality of barcodes.” This limitation is supported by Figure 3, bottom three barcodes, wherein the bottom three barcodes have the same tag 330, but the three barcodes are different as the tags are located at different locations on the backbone. Thus, for example, as shown in Figure 3, one can create three different barcodes using the same backbone molecule and the same tag by locating the tag at different location.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-26 were rejected as being obvious over Cleve in view of Dimitrov. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-26 were rejected as being obvious over Singer in view of Urdea. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The embodiments of this invention allows the use of a limited number of tags to create a multitude of barcodes, each barcode having its own unique signature, by putting the tags at different locations on the backbone of the organic molecule-containing backbone of the barcode. This unique feature has been demonstrated in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3, bottom three barcodes shows barcodes labeled 302, 303, and 304. These three barcodes have the same tag 330 located at different location of the same organic backbone molecule. Yet, these three barcodes produce different unique signature as by Raman spectroscopy as shown in Figure 4. This feature of the embodiments of the invention was neither recognized nor taught by the cited prior art *as a whole*. In short, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest methods wherein the number of barcodes in the plurality of barcodes exceed the number of different types of tags attached to the plurality of barcodes.

Application No. 10/670,701
Amendment dated July 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2007

Docket No.: 21058/0206768-US0

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/

Raj S. Davé

Registration No.: 42,465
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(202) 639-7515

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Intel Corporation